



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GRAMMATICAL NOTES.

BY CANON S. R. DRIVER, D. D.,

Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford University, Eng.

1. On Genesis II., 9 b.

In an instructive review of Budde's *Biblische Urgeschichte*, in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* for last year, p. 136, Professor Kuenen argues, from the *form* of the verse Gen. II., 9 b (ועץ החיים בתוך הגן ועץ הדעת טוב ורע), that the words ועץ הדעת טוב ורע are an addition—though an addition made by the author himself—to the original narrative. In drawing this inference, however, the learned critic appears to have overlooked a peculiarity of Hebrew style. When Hebrew writers have occasion to combine a double subject (or object) in one sentence, it is their habit, not unfrequently, to complete the clause containing one of these subjects (or objects), attaching the other to this clause subsequently. Examples: (a) Gen. xli., 27 a, where the seven ears are to be regarded, equally with the seven kine, as subjects to שבע שנים הנה, so that the ׀ has the force of “as also” (gleich wie); Num. xvi., 2 a, 18 b, 27 b; Judg. vi., 5 a, כִּי הֵם וּמִקְנֵיהֶם יַעֲלוּ וְאֶהְיֶה לָהֶם; Isa. lv., 1 a. (b) Gen. i., 16 b, where there is no occasion, with AV., to supply the verb “he made,” but, as the accents also indicate, הַכּוֹכָבִים, as well as הַמַּאֲוֵר הַקָּטָן, are appointed to rule over the night;¹ xii., 17, וַיִּנָּע “אֵת פֶּרֶעָה נִגְעִים גְּדֹלִים וְאֵת בֵּיתוֹ”; xxxiv., 29; xliii., 15 a, 18, וּלְקַחְתָּ אִתָּנוּ לְעֹבְדִים וְאֵת חֲמִרְנוֹ; Num. xiii., 23 b, 26 b, וַיִּשִׁיבוּ אֹתָם דָּבָר וְאֵת כָּל הָעֵרָה; Jer. xxvii., 7 a; 1 Kgs. v., 9; 1 Sam. vi., 11; Judg. xxi., 10 b. (c) Analogous examples with prepositions: Gen. xxviii., 14; Exod. xxxiv., 27 b, כְּרַתִּי אִתְּךָ בְּרִית וְאֵת יִשְׂרָאֵל; Deut. vii., 14 b (cf. xxviii., 54 a, 56 a); Jer. xxv., 12 (עַל); xl., 9 (ל), etc.

The words thus attached are not, in all these cases, to be treated (with Ewald, § 339 a²) as subordinate. The order in Gen. II., 9 b, is quite regular and natural. Either ועץ החיים ועץ הגן, or בתוך הגן ועץ הדעת טוב ורע, would have been inelegant and heavy. From the *form* of the verse, at any rate, no support can be derived for the conjecture of Professor Kuenen.

¹ Construe, therefore, “And God made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light, as also the stars, to rule the night.” Where two *zaqeph*s are repeated (in the same half-verse), the second always marks a less appreciable break than the first. See, e. g., i., 20 a; iii., 5 a, 17 b, etc.

² 1 Sam. xviii., 6, is pretty clearly corrupt. In xxv., 42, הלכת should probably be read (cf. Ex. ii., 5). xxix., 10, is very abnormal; analogy requires the insertion of אִתָּם after בְּנִקֵּר

2. On מֵאֵין כְּמֹדֶה (Jer. x., 6, 8).

In order to estimate the various explanations that have been offered on this difficult phrase, it will be necessary to begin by examining briefly the use of מֵאֵין, and of the allied מִבְּלִי, in Hebrew generally.

מֵאֵין occurs in the general sense of "without" in a number of passages, of which the earliest are Isa. v., 9; vi., 11; and מִבְּלִי is used similarly, from Jer. ii., 15. How is this use to be explained, and what precisely is the force attaching to the preposition in these phrases? Our readers will be familiar with the use of מֵן after verbs implying "cessation," for the purpose of defining the particular nature of the cessation intended:—"After sixty-five years Ephraim shall be broken מֵעַם *away from* (being) *a people*" (which becomes, in our idiom,¹ *so that it be no more a people*); "Every house is shut up מִבּוֹא *away from* (any) *entering in*" (= so that none entereth in); "Therefore it shall be night to you מִחֲזוֹן *away from vision*" (= that there be no vision); etc. Arguing from these, and many similar passages, we should expect in such a sentence as "The land shall be wasted *that there be no inhabitant* (or, *none passing through*, etc.)," to find the latter part expressed in Hebrew by מִיִּשְׁבַּע (or מִעֵבֶר²). Instead of this, however, we find regularly מֵאֵין יֹשֵׁב (or מִבְּלִי), and similarly with other words, מֵאֵין אָדָם, מֵאֵין עֹבֵר (or מִבְּלִי).³ One of the two negative particles מֵן or אֵין (esp. בְּלִי) must here be pleonastic; and it seems, in fact, that אֵין is added for the purpose of strengthening the idea expressed by מֵן, just as it strengthens the idea expressed by בְּלִי in a phrase which occurs in two widely separated parts of the Old Testament, and carries, therefore, with it the presumption of being a genuine Hebrew idiom:—...הַמְבְּלִי אֵין "Is it on account of there being no (literally, Is it from the deficiency of no) graves in Egypt...?" "Is it on account of there being no God in Israel...?" (Exod. xiv., 11; 2 Kgs. i., 3, 6, 16).⁴ As thus used, however, both מֵאֵין and מִבְּלִי presuppose an antecedent clause expressing some negative idea with which מֵן forms the connecting link. If, therefore, they are rendered "without," it must be recollected that this preposition is used in a pregnant sense, expressing essentially the consequences of a preceding act.

It is only in the Book of Job that מִבְּלִי is used more freely in the sense of "without," the connection with a preceding verb being no longer distinctly felt.

¹ Thus drawing attention not to the *old* state which has ceased, but to the *new* state which has arrived.

² As indeed occurs, Zech. vii., 14 (מִעֵבֶר וּמִשְׁבַּע).

³ Jer. iv., 7; ix., 9; xxvi., 9; xxxii., 43; xxxiii., 10, 12; Ezek. xiv., 15; xxxiii., 28, etc. These cases will, of course, be carefully distinguished from those in which the מֵן has a *causal* force; as Deut. ix., 28; Isa. v., 13, מִבְּלִי דַעַת *from lack of knowledge*; Hos. iv., 6; Jer. vii., 32 = xix., 11, מֵאֵין מִקּוֹם (according to Hitz., Ewald, Graf, Keil, and RV. margin).

⁴ Examples of the corresponding phrase in Syriac (ܡܢ ܠܝܢܐ) are cited by Payne Smith, *The. Syr.*, col. 528, e. g. Ephr. i., 11 (ܡܢ ܠܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܐ); Lagarde, *Reliquiae Juris Eccles.*, 141, 6; 142, 8.

Thus, iv., 20, "Without any heeding, they perish forever;" vi., 6, "Will that which is tasteless be eaten *without salt*?" xxiv., 7, "Naked they pass the night **מְבֵלִי לְבוּשׁ** *without raiment*" (cf. verse 10, "Naked they walk about **מְבֵלִי לְבוּשׁ**"); xxiv., 8, "Refuge-less they cling to the rock." The analogy of these passages makes it probable that **מְבֵלִי** has the same force in iv., 11, "The lion perisheth *without prey*;" and xxxi., 19, "If I saw one perishing *without raiment*," although otherwise "for lack of" would here afford an excellent sense. But the general difference between the use of **מְבֵלִי** in Job, and that of both **מְבֵלִי** and **מֵאִין** elsewhere, is that, in these other instances, the clause thus introduced adds a *new* feature to the description ("The land shall be wasted,"—how? *so that the condition of persons passing through ceases*), whereas in Job **מְבֵלִי** expresses little more than a *concomitant* of the description (which is not even necessarily expressed in negative terms) contained in the principal clause.

Ewald, now, explains the phrase in Jer. x., from the use of **מֵאִין** explained above. He supposes that the original and proper force of **מֵאִין** was forgotten, that it was considered simply to express the sense of a strong negation, "even none," in no necessary connection with a preceding or connected clause, and that it was thus capable of standing in any part of the sentence. He translates, therefore, **מֵאִין כְּמוֹךָ** "there is *even none* like thee," quoting, as a parallel to this free use of **מֵאִין**, Job xviii., 15, **תִּשְׁכֹּן בְּאֹהֶלוֹ מְבֵלִי לוֹ מֵאִין**, which he renders—and Delitzsch follows him¹—"there shall dwell in his tent *even naught*² of his."

Is this explanation tenable? It is true, as we have seen, that in Job **מְבֵלִי** is used more independently than elsewhere; at the same time the prepositional force of **מִן** is never entirely lost; it is still a link, though a weakened link, connecting what follows with the main sentence. Upon Ewald's hypothesis, **מֵאִין** and **מְבֵלִי** appear suddenly, not merely as independent particles, but as denoting the *subject* of a sentence. **מִן** has thus lost its negative force altogether. In this use of **מֵאִין** there is no analogy. **מְבֵלִי** in Job xviii., which is appealed to, is not decisive. If it denotes there "even naught," it expresses an entirely different sense from that which it bears in any other passage in the same book. And there is no necessity to give it such a sense even there. The **מִן** may be partitive, as it is understood by Hitzig, "There shall dwell in his tent *what is naught* of his." In the difficulty of understanding how **מִן**, in its *negative* sense, can have been treated as a mere expletive, this explanation, which gives **מִן** a natural and intelligible meaning, seems preferable. The analogy appealed to by Ewald in support of his rendering of **מֵאִין כְּמוֹךָ** is thus, at best, an uncertain one, and seems, moreover, upon independent grounds, to be improbable.

Another mode of explanation is adopted by Gesenius (*Thes.*, s. v. **מִן**), who regards **מֵאִין כְּמוֹךָ** as involving an extension of that partitive use of **מִן** which

¹ "מְבֵלִי a strengthened מְבֵלִי."

² Neuter, (not masc.), on account of the *feminine* predicate.

we meet with in **מֵאֶחָד** in Hebrew, and which occurs more frequently in Arabic, "after negative particles, and after interrogatives put in a negative sense."¹ In Arabic: "Ye have not **إِلَهَ مِنْ** *ought of god* (= any god) except Him;" "Doth *ought of one* (**مِنْ أَحَدٍ** = any, ullus) see you?" "Do you perceive of them *ought of one* (= a single one)?" "Not *ought of one* (= Not one) would hold you back," etc. In Hebrew: "If there shall be in the midst of thee a poor man, **מֵאֶחָד אֶחֶיךָ** *ought of one* (= any) of thy brethren, in one of thy gates," etc. (Deut. xv., 7); "If one doth **מֵאַחַת מֵהֵנָּה** *ought of any* (= any) of those things" (Lev. iv., 2); "If he do *ought of one* (= any) of these things" (Ezek. xviii., 10). Assuming now that **מִן** is rightly explained in these constructions as partitive, let us analyze its application to the passage in Jeremiah. **אֵין כְּמוֹךָ** means "(there is) naught of the like of thee," or, more briefly (the question of the precise meaning of **כ** not being before us) "(there is) naught like thee." **מֵאֵין כְּמוֹךָ**, then, will mean "(there is) *ought of naught like thee*." Is this an intelligible sentence? In a sentence either stating a hypothesis, or (as in the Arabic usage formulated by Dr. Wright) implying a negation, the use of **מִן** to strengthen the idea of *one only*, by assuming rhetorically a *part of one*, the existence of which is then questioned or denied, is intelligible; but a sentence affirming (as would here be done by implication) the existence of a *part of nothing* is surely an incredible one. It is not credible even on the supposition that, **מֵאֶחָד** being in use as a strengthened form of **אֶחָד**, the **מִן** was applied *mechanically* to **אֵין** for the purpose of strengthening it similarly; for the sentences in the two cases differ so widely in form and structure, that the foundation is lacking even for the operation of false analogy. Isa. XL., 17; XLI., 24 [M. T. **מֵאֶפֶס מֵאֵין וּפְעֵלְכֶם מֵאֶפֶס**] are not parallel. It is possible to say rhetorically, "Ye are of nothing and your work of naught" (whether *of* here means "a part of" [see Hitzig] or "consisting in"); but this does not justify the expression "(there is) part of naught of the like of thee."² At most, it would justify the punctuation **מֵאֵין**, and the rendering, "Part of naught is the like of thee." But this, while more artificial, is not stronger than the normal **אֵין כְּמוֹךָ**, and, though suitable where the subject is **אתם** or **פְּעֵלְכֶם**, for the purpose of declaring emphatically its equivalence with nonentity, is unsuitable when the subject is a word like **כְּמוֹךָ**. Gesenius fails to show how **מֵאֵין כְּמוֹךָ** can be intelligibly conceived as a strengthened expression for **אֵין כְּמוֹךָ**.

מֵאֵין כְּמוֹךָ appears thus to admit of no satisfactory explanation. In Jer. xxx., 7, however, occurs the expression, "Ho, for great is that day **מֵאֵין כְּמוֹךָ**." The rendering of AV. (as also of RV.), "so that none is like it," can-

¹ Dr. Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, II., § 48 f. (b). See also Ewald, *Gr. Ar.*, § 577, and the examples cited by Gesenius.

² The rendering "(There is) *less than* naught of the like of thee" reads into **מִן** more than it will legitimately express.

not be intended as a strictly literal version; for the analogy of the phrases **מֵאֵין** **וְיֵשֶׁב**, etc., would demand the punctuation **מֵאֵין כְּמֹדוֹ**; there is no example of **אֵין** being pointed as if it were in the absolute state (**אֵין**) when it precedes the word with which it is related.¹ **מֵאֵין** must here bear its usual sense of “whence?” which agrees excellently with the context, “Ho, for great is that day; whence is the like of it?” This is the rendering adopted by Hitzig, who also proposes (following J. D. Michaelis) to point and render similarly in x., 6, 8 **מֵאֵין כְּמֹדוֹ** “whence is any like thee?” Nägelsbach, indeed, objects that we have always elsewhere **מִי כְּמֹדוֹ** “who is like thee?” but, whatever be the explanation accepted, we have to deal with an unusual expression; and a construction which is logically and grammatically intelligible seems preferable to one which is so difficult to understand or justify as either of those which have been considered above. The recurrence of the same form in verse 8 makes it improbable, as Graf remarks, that the **מ** is due merely to an accidental repetition of the preceding letter (**מַלְכוּתֶם, אוֹתֶם**). The Versions (both here² and in xxx., 7) all render by a simple negative, as if the reading were **אֵין**; but where delicate distinctions are involved, their evidence, as regards either reading or construction, is of slight value. In all probability, the true meaning of the phrase had been lost by the Jews, and a false interpretation is embodied in the Massoretic punctuation.

3. On 1 Samuel I., 5.

וּלְחַנָּה יָתֵן מִנָּה אַחַת אֶפֶס כִּי אֵת חַנָּה אָהֵב וַיְהִי סֵגֶר רַחֲמָה.

The difficulty in **אֶפֶס** is well-known. It is rendered (1) “heavily.” So Coverdale (1534), following the Vulgate “tristis;” Joseph Kimchi (afterwards David Kimchi, **כְּלוּמַר בְּכַעַס הָיָה נוֹתֵן לָהּ מִנָּה אַחַת לֵבָר**, Luther, “traurig;” Sebastian Münster (1635), “facie (demissa);” Geneva margin (“some read [so, in fact, the “Great Bible” of 1539] ‘a portion with an heavy cheer’”); and among moderns, Böttcher and Thenius. For this sense of **אֶפֶס**, however, there is no support in the known usage of the language: **בְּאֶפֶס** occurs with the meaning “in anger” in Dan. xi., 20; but even supposing that an early writer would use the dual, upon the analogy of **אֶפֶס אֶפֶס**, in that sense, the meaning obtained would be unsuitable; and the expressions **נָפְלוּ פָנֶיךָ** (Gen. iv., 6) and **פָּנִיהָ לֹא** (1 Sam. i., 18) are not sufficient to justify the sense of a dejected countenance being assigned to **אֶפֶס**.

It is rendered (2), in connection with **מִנָּה אַחַת** *one portion of two faces* (= two persons), i. e., a double portion. So the Peshito (ܐܢܦܐ), Gesenius, and Keil. It is true that the Syriac ܐܦܬܐ corresponds generally in usage to the Hebrew **פָּנִים**; but, to say nothing of the fact that a Syriasm is unexpected in Samuel, there is nothing in the use of the Syriac ܐܦܬܐ to suggest that the *dual* would, in

¹ Job xxxv., 15 (see Delitzsch) will hardly be objected as an exception.

² Where, however, LXX. omits.

Hebrew, denote *two* persons; **אֶתְּ** (like **פְּנִים**) is used of *one* person, the singular not occurring. If **אֶפְסִים** means *two* persons, it must be implied that **אֶף**, in Hebrew, might denote *one* person, which the meaning of the word obviously does not allow. Secondly, the construction, if this rendering were correct, would be unexampled. **מִנָּה אֶפְסִים** evidently cannot be a genitive after the compound **מִנָּה אַחַת**; and the disparity between the two ideas (*one portion* and *two persons*) precludes us from treating it as a case of apposition (as is suggested by Keil);¹ Ewald, § 287 b, offers, in this respect, nothing parallel. Grammatically, therefore, not less than lexically, this rendering is exposed to the gravest objections.

(3) The history of the A.V. *a worthy portion* (inherited from the Genevan Version of 1560) is curious. It is based ultimately upon the rendering of the Targum: "And to Hannah he gave **חֹלֶק חָד בְּחִיר** *one choice portion*," which is thus paraphrased by Rashi **רָאוּי לְהִתְקַבֵּל בְּסִבְר פְּנִים יְפוֹת** "a portion fit to be received with a cheerful countenance." **בְּחִיר** in the Targum corresponds to the Heb. **אֶפְסִים**; how it was obtained from it may not be perfectly certain; but Kimchi seeks apparently to explain it, when he annotates the text thus, **מִנָּה אַחַת נִכְבְּרַת² לְהַשִּׁיב אֶפְסָה וְכַעֲסָה וְכֵן אֶרֶךְ אֶפְסִים אֶרֶךְ כַּעֲס**—in the Latin of Seb. Münster, "*partem unam electam: hoc est, dedit Hannae partem honorificam at ab ea auferet animi et vultus molestiam.*" As here explained, "*worthy*" is no translation of **אֶפְסִים**, but merely expresses a characteristic of the particular "*portion*" sufficient to produce the desired result. But this explanation is only of historical interest; it is evident that **אֶפְסִים** alone cannot mean "against" or "to remove vexation." In the *Book of Roots*, however (*s. v.* **אֶף**), there is suggested as an alternative **אוּ פִירוּשׁוֹ רָאוּיָהּ לְפָנִים כְּלוֹמַר מִנָּה נִכְבְּרַת**. This explanation is easier, but is open to objections, upon ground of usage and construction, similar to those already urged against (2).

In the LXX. **אֶפְסִים** is represented by $\pi\lambda\eta\nu$, i. e., **אַפְסִים**. This reading at once relieves the difficulty of the verse, and affords a consistent and grammatical sense. **כִּי אֶפְסִים** restricts or qualifies the preceding clause, precisely as in Num. XIII., 28. "But unto Hannah he used to give one portion;" this, following the **מִנּוֹת** of verse 4, might seem to imply that Elkanah felt less affection towards her than towards her sister. To obviate such a misconception, the writer continues, "Howbeit he loved Hannah, but the Lord had shut up her womb," the last clause assigning the reason why Hannah received but one portion. The words $\delta\tau\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \eta\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\delta\iota\omicron\nu\nu$ in LXX. before $\pi\lambda\eta\nu$ seem to be merely an explanatory addition inserted by the translators, and need not be supposed to have formed part of the Hebrew text read by them.

¹ See the Appendix to the writer's *Hebrew Tenses*, § 290.

² Cf. Abulwalid (11th century), **وَجْهَةٌ عَظِيمَةٌ**.